



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

crushed by brute force ; skilled labour by manufacture ; genius is bought or enslaved by wealth, and material is more valued than art—except that of adulteration. Wealth and honour are showered upon the lucky inventor who can profitably adulterate some article in daily use ; who can entwine wool and cotton and yet cry *de-laine* ; who can substitute strychnine for hops in beer ; silica for soda in soap ; sloes for the juice of grapes ; and, rivalling the giant whom Jack slew, grinds the bones of Englishmen to make their bread.*

Thus the truth of our science has even greater enemies to contend with than the imprecations of snobs or learned corporations, as it fights with a monster whose diploma may be summed up in one small word—SHAM.

But a day will dawn which will see the garotte placed on the throat of this murderer of the noble and intelligent of the age. Then will crushed Nature return to the freedom of her youth. When such finds a dishonoured grave and is not represented in Parliament we may then in honesty gaze on our physiognomy in a glass, and forget what manner of men we were ; for we fear until this consummation, physiognomy, as opposed to counterfeit, by teaching us to know our neighbours, and above all to know ourselves, will remain unpopular.

GRECIAN ANTHROPOLOGY.†

IN the pursuance of his great design of illustrating the anthropology of the Italian Peninsula, Dr. G. Nicolucci has added another important contribution to the excellent series already issued. This fresh labour refers immediately to the anthropology of Greece, which could scarcely have been omitted from his plan, as the two countries, although originally peopled by tribes distinct from each other, have been so much connected, certainly since the days of the Romans, and by emigration much earlier, that the anthropology of the one could hardly have been rendered complete without attempting that of the other. Indeed, that section of Dr. Nicolucci's scheme immediately

* After the Crimean war large cargoes of bones were brought from the Crimea. They were of a variety of animals—horses, cattle, sheep, and even men ; these were mostly ground for agricultural purposes, but the whiter and better specimens were selected for the flour mill. This gives a reality to Fee-faa-foo-fum, the declaration of the giant—(War ?) unknown before.

† *Sull' Antropologia della Grecia. Memoria di Giustiniano Nicolucci, con 5 tavole. Napoli, 1867, quarto.*

preceding the one now issued had reference to the Japygians, a people who occupied the south-eastern corner of Italy, were regarded as of Pelasgic origin, and as having in primitive times wandered from the opposite coast of the Adriatic.*

To attempt the anthropology of Greece demands a very accomplished and masterly hand. The author enters upon his erudite labour with a true conception of its stirring interest, and in a right spirit. He exclaims—"Greece! that magical name, which remains from our earliest years engraven on our hearts and in our minds; that name which by its mere pronunciation awakens in us the glorious memory of a people, which by the spontaneous and natural development of its own forces knew how to elevate itself to the representation of the most noble and highest idea of humanity; that name could not but attract the attention of the anthropologist, who, in one race embracing the sum of human perfection, seeks to point out what may have been its physical conformation, and, especially, what was the form, the volume, and the capacity of its skull, the chamber of the brain, the organ most significative in the diversified manifestations of intelligence." (P. 1.)

Dr. Nicolucci is at once led to the difficult question of "The first inhabitants of Greece." He says, we know from the Greeks themselves that their country was inhabited in ancient times by various tribes, which they afterwards distinguished as barbarous, and among these was one, numerous and powerful, that bore the name of Pelasgi. The ante-historical times of man are involved in so much obscurity that we dare not risk the opinion whether the various populations scattered through the land of the Hellenes belonged to one race, all having relations in origin and customs with the Pelasgi, and much less are we able to regard as certain that there might be as many races represented in the territory of Hellas as there were nations of various names which divided the possession of that country. Yet he hopes the investigation of the allusions preserved in the historians, poets, and geographers, into which he enters, but into which we are not able to follow him, may afford some light in resolving these delicate questions. Still, what relations the Thracians of Macedonia and the other tribes of other districts of the country bore both to the Pelasgi and also to the Hellenes, is a problem which truly may never be resolved conclusively. There seems much probability that an Egyptian colony, conducted by Danaus, anciently occupied the territory of Argolis, and gave the name of its leader to the Pelasgic people who inhabited the country before; but it is not equally probable that Cecrops might

* *Sulla Stirpe Japigica e sopra tre Crani ad essa appartenenti.* Per Giustiniano Nicolucci, con 3 tavole. Napoli, 1866, quarto.

have come from the same region of the Nile with many emigrants, and imparted his name to Attica, previously called Acte, and from him Cecropia. Although this migration is held for true by some historians of modern times, no one has confided in it ; some ancient authorities among the Greeks themselves always considered Cecrops as an autochthon, or born on that soil which was the theatre of his fabulous exploits.

Yet it was universally accepted by all antiquity that the Phœnicians came with Cadmus into Bœotia, where they built the city of Cadmia, which afterwards became Thebes ; and assuredly historical records not only retain as true the Phœnician origin of the population of the Cadmian portion of Bœotia, but also tell us that the idiom spoken in Thebes retained not a few foreign elements. That city boasted of having received from its Phœnician colonists the precious gift of letters, and, even in the time of Pausanias, they showed the ruins of monuments, records of Phœnician worship.

The arrival of a Phrygian colony with Pelops is attested by the authority of many writers, and, the author thinks, acquires greater probability by recent investigations. Still the earliest traditions give Pelops the credit to have been a native Grecian. Of the presence of Thracians in different parts of Greece, and especially in Macedonia, Thessaly, Bœotia, and Attica, the testimony of the ancients is so uniform that it cannot be doubted ; but, as the author remarks, it is uncertain to what race they belonged. The Thracians of Herodotus were a rude and uncultivated people, composed of not less than twenty-two tribes, among which Finns and Slaves held the first place. The Pierians, a Thracian people, were honoured and revered by the Greeks in all times as the institutors of civilisation and propagators of religion. Hence the difficulty of regarding the early barbarous Thracians as the people thus accredited. K. O. Müller has met this difficulty by concluding that there were two distinct races of Thracians. Speaking of the aboriginal Thracians he says, " poets who sang in an unintelligible barbarous language could not have had more influence on the mental development of the people than the twittering of birds."

But it is needless to refer to the traditions and legends of other races till we come to the Pelasgi, so numerous and powerful, whose authority extended over the greater part of Greece. Besides all Thessaly, they inhabited Epirus ; their name was also heard in Bœotia, whence they expelled all the other barbarians who occupied it, although they did not continue there long, but were in their turn driven into Attica ; but Attica was already Pelasgic before this immigration of Bœotian Pelasgi. Like Attica, according to Strabo, Ephoros asserts the Peloponnesus to have been Pelasgian, which indeed bore the name

of Pelasgic, and certainly, if not all, the major part at least of the Peninsula was possessed before the Doric invasion by the Pelasgic race. Argolis, Achaia, Arcadia, were countries which all Greece held to be Pelasgic, and the traditions, the history, the local names leave no doubt as to the origin of their populations.

But who were these Pelasgi? What were their ethnic relations either with the Hellenes or with the other barbarous races who occupied Grecian territory? We have not sufficient testimony to tell either their epoch, their limits of residence, their actions, or their characters; but, from what may be collected from Herodotus, they were not Hellenes, because they spoke a barbarous language, distinct from the Hellenic.

Among these various elements, at length the Hellenic race rendered themselves predominant, and became the sole representatives of the population of Hellas or Greece. Great interminglings of people still continued in the country, for which it was particularly well suited, where the people could so easily change from place to place. The author excuses himself from noting the principal of these migrations, and from seeking to explain in what ways and by what means the race of the Hellenes extended and spread themselves over the whole of Greece.

Hellen, the son of Deucalion, is certainly a mythic personage. Neither the epoch of his existence, nor his genealogy can be accepted as historical data. But the fable contains in itself a very elevated meaning; it serves to attest the national relations which existed among all the Greeks, and may suffice for an indication whence follow the chief divisions of the Greek race. The sons of Hellen extended themselves from Thessaly through the whole of Greece, and mingling and confounding themselves with the barbarous and Pelasgic tribes, impressed upon all a common physiognomy, and established that national unity which was not the last boast of Greece.

In his chapter entitled "The Hellenes," Dr. Nicolucci traces, by the ancient legends, the descendants of this mythical Hellen, his three sons, Aeolus, Dorus, and Xuthus, their conquests, their migrations, the cities and states and the dynasties they founded, in a highly interesting manner. He then refers to "The return of the Heraclidæ and the Doric conquest of the Peloponnesus," that great event which stands between the legendary and the historical epochs of Greece. To this subject also the author devotes a chapter, to which he looks for some development of the connections which joined together the various branches of the Greek stock, and the probable relations of these with the races that preceded the Hellenic element on the soil of Greece.

But it may be noted that, notwithstanding this successive exten-

sion of the Hellenes through the whole of Greece, and their conquests over the barbarians or non-Hellenic tribes, if we were to have asked the Greeks themselves whence they came—from what country they had first turned their footsteps towards Greece, they, who were such keen investigators of their own origins, would have answered,—from no other country, they were autochthones, who were born and who multiplied in the same land in which they lived. This was often their boast.*

The author then goes on to tell us that the comparative study of languages has, in recent times, come to take the Greeks from that isolation to which their national pride had condemned them. They are now no longer *autochthones*, no more born of the soil, but connected by the indissoluble bonds of language to all those other people which compose the group of the Aryan, or Indo-European family. A common language was at one time spoken by the ancestors of all these people before they separated from one another, and that language, now no longer living, was the common mother of many, among which the Greek holds an eminent position.

This stupendous hypothesis, which has the advantage of having an era lost in impenetrable antiquity, is supposed to afford a better solution of the origin of the Greeks than their own simple deduction upon this obscure subject. They perceived the defect of all historical or traditionary data for their origin, and hence inferred that they were sons of the soil. There were no developmentalists in those days. The researches of modern comparative philology have given rise to a much bolder *inference*, that the Greeks and all other European races are immigrants, according to our author, from the Hindoo Koosh, and the surrounding regions, from whence tribes of India also emigrated in a south-eastern direction.†

It is not, we suppose, pretended that philological notions of this kind, even allowing that to many disciples they carry their own conviction with them, are to be received instinctively or absolutely, like the truths of mathematics. Such certainly has been very much the lot of this Aryan hypothesis; but may not the philosophical reasons for it be questioned? Might it not have been expected that before such a doctrine could have been put forth, supposing its philological

* This reminds us of the amusing conversation with the North American Indian presumed by Catlin, when questioned as to where he came from. *Manners, Customs, and Condition of the North American Indians*, vol. ii, p. 230.

† It is almost needless to say that this is merely the region defined by our author, as the primal seat of the Aryans. There is no fixity of opinion among the acceptors of the Aryan hypothesis with respect to this primal seat, almost every writer defines it differently, as Persia, etc.; and well he may, for we are not aware of anything to limit the selection any writer chooses to make.

grounds to be irrefragible, its authors and recipients would have sought for it some extraneous support, out of the immediate domain of philology? It is not unusual in science, where such mighty deductions are formed, bearing upon such very important subjects as this, to seek confirmation from other branches of knowledge, which are capable of lending support or otherwise. Do the facts admit of no other explanation? In truth is this the most plausible explanation of these facts? Are there any archæological or other data to show that any Indo-European race ever dwelt in Bactriana, that such people ever passed through Khorassan and Mazanderan, through Persia, Armenia and Asia Minor to the shores of the Hellespont, or that they were ever present in any of these countries? History knows nothing of these things whatever. Still we cannot be required to suppose that the Indo-Europeans took this incredible journey of about three thousand miles without resting in the countries through which they passed, and without leaving abundant traces of their residence as they went. But it may be said that this transmigration happened long before the earliest history had its date. Still we see palæontology and archæology rendering their testimony not only to the actual existence, but even to the grade in humanity of the man of the drift period, who preceded the Indo-European migration, it may be safely said, if we do not misunderstand the hypothesis, by many ages. Is it not, therefore, reasonable to ask for confirmatory evidence before we admit that races of a totally different and more exalted kind have traversed Asia and Europe in search of a home? Does not even the very magnitude of this hypothesis, before which all other events in human history sink into insignificance, demand an abundance of incontrovertible confirmatory evidence before it can be admitted as a sound philological inference? Should not the propounders of the hypothesis indicate some motive for emigrations at that most ancient period, some reasonable and even plausible motive? for if man were man in those distant ages, he would not take a march from the Hindoo Koosh into Eastern or Western Europe, a direct march or a progress interrupted by longer or shorter periods of repose, without most pressing motives, without plans, without objects in view of a more or less definite character. Such a proceeding among a society of human beings is absolutely incredible. Yet the propounders of the Indo-European hypothesis are not known to have made the attempt to smooth these difficulties to the reception of their doctrine. Still, the fact is that such has been the deference which has been paid to the great and indisputable learning of these philological philosophers, that their doctrine, notwithstanding all its improbabilities, has been embraced without inquiry and without hesitancy.

Were men produced by some process much quicker than the ordinary mode of generation in those days? and did they so accumulate in this elevated central region of Asia, that they were obliged to seek room in which to dwell? If so, this is contrary to all we know of mankind, and certainly requires to be proved before it can be received. If they were so numerous and over-populous, did the same plague of progeny abide with them through the whole of their course, so that they could find no intermediate permanent resting place till they had traversed countries three thousand miles long in a direct line before they reached Hellas and Western Europe? It is still scarcely quite superfluous to ask whether the new countries through which the Indo-European families are supposed to have travelled in the line of their migration were peopled or were mere wastewildernesses? It is now allowed that they were inhabited; hence is it not almost certain that the course of the emigrants, or perhaps more properly vagrants, would have been continually interrupted; that they would have had to fight their way through many hostile tribes of primitive men?

The advocates of the hypothesis finding in some of the languages of the countries through which they have chosen to conduct the Aryans in this wondrous migration, either resemblances of vocabulary, resemblance of structure, or other more refined and indefinite lingual resemblances, have considered these to be proofs of the migration itself; but it may still be asked, are these sufficient evidences to carry the Aryans through all difficulties, and to establish the validity of the migration? Also it may be asked, may not the phenomena admit of an easier and more philosophical explanation? As the antiquitousness of the whole of this suppositional transmigration is not so vast as to preclude some other connecting links between the Aryan race in its cradle in Bactriana and its settlement in Hellas, have we not a right to expect many supporting pillars for this hypothesis before receiving it?

Our author is contented with merely quoting a passage from one of the learned propounders of this hypothesis in its support, to show that Bactriana was suitable for its development, because of the temperate climate of this region, its varied and fertile soil, and its central geographical position. He says, "it constitutes the great centre of communication between internal Asia and western countries." If so, is it not remarkable that it should have been so little travelled either in historical times or in modern days? But who does not see that other regions might easily be pointed out quite equal, if not superior, in all those qualities which fit Bactriana in the eyes of Professor Pictet for the birth-place of the Indo-European races? So that, as far as we

see, there is no other or better foundation for this vast hypothesis than the philological one. We may then turn back to the question and ask, may not the lingual facts admit of some easier, less fanciful, explanation consistent with what we know of the history of mankind? We know a little of the history of Bactriana. We know that it was visited by those enterprising and immortal people who have engaged the pen of Dr. Nicolucci.

Anterior to the Greek period, Bactriana had been invaded by Assyrian and Persian monarchs. Diodorus, from Ctesias, tells us of the invasion of the country by Ninus and Semiramis, the founders of the Assyrian Empire, more than two thousand years before Christ. Also that Cyrus, the founder of the Persian Empire, made war on the Bactrians. And Herodotus relates that Artaxerxes Longimanus, somewhere about 450 B.C., repressed the revolt of the Bactrians. But the historical event which stands out prominently above all others in the history of Bactriana, is the expedition of the Macedonian monarch, Alexander the Great, to India. In the year 329 B.C. Alexander crossed the Paropamisus, and entered Bactria.

We have no intention to follow the Macedonian in his conquests, but will merely quote a passage which expresses in a brief and summary way some of the results of this wonderful campaign. "The history of Alexander forms an important epoch in the history of mankind. Unlike other Asiatic conquerors, his progress was marked by something more than devastation and ruin ; at every step of his course the Greek language and civilisation took root and flourished ; and after his death Greek kingdoms were formed in all parts of Asia, which continued to exist for centuries. By his conquests the knowledge of mankind was increased ; the sciences of geography, natural history, and others, received vast additions ; and it was through him that a road was opened to India, and that Europeans became acquainted with the products of the remote east." On the death of Alexander, a Greek dynasty was established in Bactriana, and a succession of Greek sovereigns ensued, who struck coins in their own names, and, in imitation of the Persian monarchs, assumed the title of "king of kings."

It might be asked, do the historians of Alexander's campaigns inform us that, when the Greeks reached this remote country, they found the people, in their persons, their habits, their manners and customs, their government, architecture, or in any other particulars—especially their language—so closely resembling Europeans, more intimately themselves, so that they were inclined to suspect that the two races had a common origin? Has there ever been any proof that the Greeks ob-

* *Smith's Dictionary of Greece and Rome, Biography and Mythology*, art. Alexander III, vol. i, p. 122.

served any of these things, or ever spoke of them? Yet from what we *know* of human races in all parts of the globe, their permanency and unchangeableness, the general parallelism of the development of the same race in different countries, we have a right to expect these Indo-European invaders, if they were Indo-Europeans or Aryans, although the secret was wholly unsuspected by themselves, would have been filled with amazement upon this very point of resemblance. The author tells us at the opening of his memoir, that the Greeks themselves owed their highest elevation to "the spontaneous and natural development of their own forces." Is it to be conceived that "the spontaneous natural development" of their brethren in Ariana and Bactria had no results? Is this true philosophy, or do like causes produce unlike effects?

According to the hypothesis, the Aryans could not have been rude barbarians, but must have been a somewhat civilised and accomplished people, or they certainly could not have undertaken the supposed migration and carried it to a successful issue. They must besides have been the speakers of a well-developed language, bearing upon its surface a striking resemblance, in its vocabulary and in its forms, to that of the invaders. Perhaps it is not improper to add that upwards of two thousand years ago, the likeness between the two tongues must have been somewhat greater than that which is found between Sanskrit and Greek at the present day.

It might be asked, does Arrian or Quintus Curtius, in their histories of Alexander's great oriental campaign, anywhere allude to such a likeness between the language of the Bactrians and that of their invaders? We are not aware of anything in the works of these historians which have come down to us that can be quoted as giving any valid support to the Aryan hypothesis; and it may still be asked whether we have not a right to expect such passages referring to some of the very complex relations presumed to have existed previously between this mother country of Bactriana and Greece?

The Greeks, according to this view, like all the rest of their brethren of Europe, came from the east, and the region from whence they set out was that to which the "Indo-European traditions" carry us back, viz. the region of Bactria, between the Indus on the south, Bukharia on the north, Belurtag on the east, and the territories of Merv and Herat on the west. Setting out from Bactriana, the Aryo-Hellenes pushed onward through the region of Herat, and continuing their route towards the Hellespont, through Khorassan and Mazanderan, they finally reached Thrace, Macedonia, and Thessaly, from whence they scattered themselves through the remaining countries of Hellas.

We know that it is asserted that the Aryan immigration, from whence

the Greeks are supposed to have derived their origin, took place at a prehistoric period presumed to be immensely remote. In truth, the doctrine is, as explained by our author, that in the earliest primitive times the country of Hellas was inhabited by barbarous tribes. We may probably suppose that these rude people were the contemporaries of the man of the drift period or the man of the cave period ; that they lived in the age of the mammoth, the *Rhinoceros tichorinus*, or perhaps the reindeer, and no doubt long afterwards ; and also, perhaps, that they used flint tools and weapons. Subsequently—how long subsequently no one has yet ventured to declare—the Aryan invaders came among these barbarous tribes, like Xerxes in a succeeding age, and, with or without struggle, took possession of their country, and not only settled in it, but made it their own. So that in reality the barbarous tribes are the autochthones, from whom, according to the hypothesis, the Greeks are not regarded to have been the descendants.

Although there may be but exceedingly faint indications, or perhaps no indication, of the communication of Greeks with this distant country of Bactriana much before Alexander's invasion, there cannot be any doubt that there had long been some commercial intercourse. We may therefore ask, what ought we to expect from the intercourse of so polished a people as the Greeks with countries wrapt in oriental despotism and mediocrity ? What effects might be expected upon their arts and their language, if not before, especially when Bactria became a Greek dependency ? Has Great Britain produced no effect in India ? Is it not almost certain that the Greeks emigrated in considerable numbers to Bactria ? Men of talent, who must have taken with them their arts, their learning, their literature and their language, to be communicated to the orientals, to receive from these latter subtle and mystical people the impress of the working of their own minds upon the gifts. This is not the place in which to attempt any answer to this or to any of the preceding questions. Besides which they are questions that demand a learning of another kind, almost as profound and varied as that of the founders of the Indo-European hypothesis themselves. We can only confine ourselves here to two or three facts.

The Bactrian *alphabet* has not, as might have been expected if not required from the Aryan hypothesis, an independent oriental origin. On the contrary, the ablest scholars derive it from the same source as the Greek alphabet itself. Both are derived from the Semitic, or Phœnicio-Babylonian. M. Ernest Renan and Mr. Edward Thomas agree upon this point. The former appears to regard the eighth century before the Christian era as the period of the extension of the Semitic

alphabet to Bactria,* but upon what authority the latter confesses he is unable to discover.† Mr. Thomas says, that “B.C. 250 is the earliest epoch at which any example of Bactrian epigraphy can at present be quoted.”

It is known that the Greeks did not find their supposed ancestors in Bactria, or in any of its surrounding regions, using a *coinage*, or anything deserving of the name. They most probably employed the precious metals as a medium of exchange, but had nothing deserving of the name of a coinage, if even they possessed plates and bullæ of gold and silver stamped with any characters to be used as a coinage. Quintius Curtius does not mention a coinage, and there are no remains of any such coinage—we mean a coinage such as had been developed in Macedonia and the other states of Greece. Ancient coins are unquestionably now found in great numbers in these very countries; but are these the representatives of those states which remained behind when the Indo-European tribes emigrated from the Hindoo Koosh and its surrounding regions? We have never been asked to suppose among other things that the emigrants left none of their brethren behind, but fled from their temperate clime and their fertile soil as they would have fled from a plague spot, leaving none behind. Indeed the hypothesis demands a strong remnant to have been left in this cradle of the stock. Indian and Aryan numismatics have now been extensively studied, and the question of the origin of the art of coinage in the east discussed by many able and competent men. They have none of them pretended to have found in Bactria coins indicative of a refined and powerful nation, before it became connected with Greece. On the contrary, the earliest period of this oriental coinage was certainly not distinguished by coins superior to those of the ancient Britons; they were not even equal to those debased imitations of the coins of the Greek colonies. The

* “Un fait beaucoup plus important que tous ceux qui viennent d’être cités, est la transmission qui se fit, vers le VIII^e siècle avant notre ère, de l’alphabet Sémitique à tous les peuples du monde ancien, par l’action combinée de la Phénicie et de Babylone. Semé sur toutes les côtes de la Méditerranée jusqu’en Espagne, porté vers le midi jusqu’au fond de l’Ethiopie, gagnant vers l’Orient jusqu’au Pendjab, l’alphabet Sémitique fut adopté spontanément par tous les peuples qui le connurent.” *Hist. et Système Comparé des Langues Sémitiques*. Paris, 1855, p. 195.

† *Essays on Indian Antiquities*. By James Prinsep. Edited by Ed. Thomas. London, 1858, vol. ii, p. 145. It appears from a Memoir read before the Asiatic Society, February 3, 1868, that Mr. Edward Thomas now in some measure may concur in this view of M. Renan. “Specimens of which writing (in the Pehlvi alphabet, which is derived from Phœnico-Babylonian teachings) in an already fixed and cultivated form, occur as early as the time of Sargon, B.C. 721.”

coins of India at first were mere "small unstamped flattened pieces of silver or other metal, either quite smooth or bearing only a few punch-marks on one or both sides."* The question whether a die-struck coinage existed at all in India, prior to the period when the Greco-Bactrian coinage made its appearance, has been debated, and the authorities preponderate on the side of such coinage being entirely an imitation of this latter production, which may be satisfactorily referred to the Greeks. That any coinage of a better kind was current in Bactria at a much earlier period than Alexander's invasion—a pre-Greek coinage—has never been discovered or even dreamed of. If in their emigration the Aryans left behind them a race of people of equal endowments, who must have had the same wants, why had they not developed a coinage even of the same high character as the Greeks before these people returned to visit them again? Indeed, we may safely conclude that the people of Bactria and of India, like the ancient Britons, were equally indebted for the great advance of a coinage, to the Greeks. Prinsep says with justice, "coinage is certainly one of the improvements which has travelled, and is still travelling, eastward."†

There are many *antiquities* in the countries surrounding the Hindoo Koosh. Afghanistan abounds in ruins, from which antiquities of native origin and of very great interest are continually dug up. Sculptures of various kinds are common, sometimes entire figures of good size are met with, very often carved figures in relief of a small size, representing dignified personages with their attendants, most probably kings, to whom prisoners are brought, as in the Egyptian and Assyrian sculptures and paintings, to receive condign punishment at the monarch's own hand.‡

A still higher style of art is often met with among these sculptures, which is sure at some not remote period to engage the attention of students of the fine arts deeply. We are only able to introduce in woodcuts two examples of these beautiful productions. It should be mentioned that they are executed in a hard, fine-grained and very dark slaty stone, full of shining particles of mica, which is capable of rendering as fine a surface as marble.

The first figure is somewhat like Jupiter Ammon. The second is a

* Prinsep, *op. cit.*, i, 209.

† *Op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 4.

‡ In one of these bas-reliefs, in the possession of the writer, the monarch is seen seated in the oriental fashion, with his knees spread out and his hands upon them, on a throne, and clothed in a *pallium*. His face is without beard or moustache, his head uncovered, and his hair elegantly arranged and tied in a knot on the crown of his head, in a Spartan fashion. Before the throne lies a figure upon his back, and with his shield under him, who may be regarded as a prisoner, as his feet are cut off. Beside this man is an ape upon his feet. The whole scene appears to be taking place before

fine face of a youth with moustaches, of Persian look, the hair treated in a manner that is entirely Greek. The round node on the forehead is oriental; it is the Hindoo *tika*, possibly subsequent to the supre-



Bearded Man. Afghan Marble. Half size.

macy of Buddhism, and is common in the series. But both figures must be regarded as strongly indicative of Grecian art, and that of a high order.

It is not pretended that the ruins of Afghanistan, whence these ancient sculptures are derived, are of any very remote antiquity. They are classed under two separate chronological heads, as "Ancient Ruins," and "Modern Ruins," which possess also different architectural characters. The former class are, without exception, the relics of different

a temple, one of the square pillars of which is represented with its foliated capital. On the pedestal of this pillar are standing, in repose, a man and a woman fully draped, with a Grecian appearance. A man in oriental costume, and with a turban on his head, bracelets on his arms (another prisoner) is being brought up to the king by an attendant. The deposition of stalagmitic matter upon the *fractured* surfaces of these figures, is an indication that they have been broken or destroyed at a remote period of time.

bygone idolatrous nations, whilst the latter, on the other hand, are of a comparatively recent date, and all of Mahomedan origin.



Moustached head. Afghan Marble. Half size.

"The ancient ruins appear to be mostly of Buddhist origin, if not of even more ancient date ; for, in the time of Alexander, which was antecedent to the Buddhist era, this region was peopled by Indian tribes, who had many strong or extensive fortresses in commanding parts of the highland tracts, the attack and capture of which so greatly added to the Macedonian conqueror's fame."* The antiquities more particularly described by Mr. Bellew in his curious and instructive volume are rock inscriptions, one of which is regarded as one of those pillar edicts issued by Asoka, publishing the establishment of the Buddhist faith as the state religion, about 250 B.C. ;† cave temples, hermit cells, idol temples and cities. The modern ruins are Mahomedan.

Having adverted to the language, the coinage, and the arts, all of which, in a *prima facie* view, seem to indicate more or less of a Greek influence, we may turn to anthropological considerations, at which we shall only glance. But, before doing this, it may not be unadvisable to mention that all philologists even are not unanimous in their admiration and appropriation of the Aryan hypothesis of the German scholars. Mr. Hewitt Key Professor of Comparative Grammar in Univer-

* *A General Report on the Yusufzais.* By H. W. Bellew. Lahore : 1864, p. 109.

† *Ibid.*, p. 113.

sity College, London, delivered a lecture in 1862, in which he made serious objections to the antiquity of the Sanskrit language and writings themselves. In this lecture he exhibits great modesty and that respect for truth which becomes a man of science. At the commencement he says, "It would have been simply indecent if the present writer had expressed his fears in the form of a direct proposition, conscious as he is that he comes to the inquiry wholly destitute of what may at first be deemed an essential requisite, a knowledge of the Sanskrit language. . . . The question here naturally suggests itself, how it is that I have taken upon myself to enter into a contest for which I am confessedly so ill-equipped? And my answer is that I find the same suspicions which have found a way into my own mind entertained by many others, and those, too, gentlemen whose position as scholars gives great weight to their opinions, though, like myself, they are wholly wanting in the special qualification—a knowledge of Sanskrit."*

The worth and reliability of the materials upon which the knowledge of the Sanskrit is built may be estimated by the following remarks of Professor Key, "I do not propose to enter into the domain of Sanskrit history and chronology, a task for which I am wholly unfitted, especially as those who have the best qualifications admit that it is involved in the greatest obscurity, nor indeed could one expect easily to find materials for accurate investigation in such a literature as that of the Vêdas. The 'Mantras,' on the one hand, dealing for the most part in 'the devotional,' and the 'Brahmanas,' on the other, with 'the ceremonial and dogmatic,' can scarcely be available for such a purpose. As to the Upanishads, or the short appended treatises, I will be satisfied with a second-hand quotation from a work of a learned Hindû, that they 'contain some rude indications of philosophic thought, and, like the twinkling stars on a dark night, may occasionally serve as guides in a history of Hindû philosophy. They do not however exhibit any great attempt at method, arrangement, classification, or argument. Even there the poetry predominates over the logic. Bold ideas abruptly strike your fancy, but you find no clue to the associations which called them forth in the author's mind, and search in vain for the reasons on which they are based. Sublime thoughts are not wanting, but they resemble sudden flashes, at which you may gaze for a moment, but are immediately after left in deeper darkness than ever. Nor are they free from those irregular flights of the imagination in which poets with vitiated tastes delight to indulge, setting

* Qveritvr. *The Sanskrit language, as the basis of linguistic science, and the labours of the German school in that field, are they not over-valued?* By T. Hewitt Key, M.A., F.R.S. Berlin, 1863: pp. 2 and 3.

at defiance all rules of decency and morality." (Banergea, *Westminster Review*, New Series, vol. xxii, p. 463.) Professor Key proceeds to the etymologies of the Sanskritists, and exposes them in a very amusing manner. In the second part of his published brochure he criticises Bopp's *Comparative Grammar* and Max Müller's *Lectures*, the great *principia* of the science, in a manner which no one except a learned philologer could do.

In truth the result of a reading of Professor Key's pamphlet is a strong feeling of doubt, whether the Sanskritists are not presuming very much upon the general and total ignorance of men of science regarding the whole of the subjects embraced in their own studies. The dicta of these learned men cannot be disputed, since they are not understood. The preliminary knowledge requisite for their being understood is very rarely acquired. An impression deeply confirmed when we notice Professor Key's hesitation, and the obvious reluctance with which even he ventures to dispute many of the points connected with the great hypothesis.

Another distinguished English philologist appears to be not at all disposed to embrace the views of Sanskritists in general, but rather to dissent from most of them. Dr. Latham has said, in his *Varieties of Man*, that "the nation that is at one and the same time Asiatic and Indo-Germanic, remains to be discovered. . . . I abstain from any positive expression of opinion as to the quarter from which the Sanskrit language originated. That the language which stands in the same relation to it, as the Italian does to the Latin, has yet to be discovered I firmly believe; to which I may add that, except in Asia Minor or Europe, I do not know where to look for it."† The opinions of Dr. Latham upon this subject have been summed up by Professor De Quatrefages, in his recent learned and very able Report on the Progress of Anthropology, which is, in truth, an elaborate argument in support of monogenism, somewhat unlike Prichard's in one respect, as it is the argument of a naturalist who has argued diligently and much more boldly, still, it may be much doubted whether more successfully, than his great predecessor. De Quatrefages, speaking of "European Origins," says, "Quant à Latham, il reconnaît que l'histoire est muette sur les premières migrations; mais, recourant à la méthode *à priori*, il pense qu'elles ont dû avoir bien de l'aire la plus étendue vers l'aire la plus resserrée, et il conclut que le siège premier du Sanskrit a dû être à l'est ou au sud-est des contrées où se parle le lithuanien, et que son origine est européenne."‡

* Ibid., p. 3.

† Latham's *Varieties of Man*, p. 547.

‡ *Rapport sur les Progrès de l'Anthropologie*. Par M. A. de Quatrefages. Paris, 1867: p. 482.

The venerable Mr. John Crawfurd also, another able philologist, versed in the languages of the east, sees no truth whatever in the Aryan hypothesis. He concludes his lucid memoir upon the subject thus. "From the facts I have adduced in the course of this paper I must come to the conclusion that the theory which makes all the languages of Europe and Asia, from Bengal to the British Islands, however different in appearance, to have sprung from the same stock, and hence, all the people speaking them, black, swarthy, and fair, to be of one and the same race of man, is utterly groundless and the mere dream of very learned men, and perhaps even more imaginative than learned."*

There are many difficulties which stand in the way of the reception of the Indo-European hypothesis of an anthropological nature. Some of these have been well stated by Professor Broca, in his article "Anthropologie,"* which has been translated in two numbers of this *Review* (Vol. v, p. 193 ; Vol. vi, p. 35). This excellent writer shows that human types have been permanent and unchangeable, as far as the historic period reaches ; that the man of the ancient Egyptian monuments is the man of to-day, and so among all other races. But the admission of the Aryan hypothesis supposes that almost all the races of Europe as well as of India have been derived from one pre-historic primæval race, and that the great differences among these various peoples have been produced by many causes, operating through a great succession of ages. This is contrary to all our knowledge, but in respect to the propounders of the hypothesis, admits of being supposed and presumed. Dr. Broca attempts in various ways to reconcile it with the teachings of anthropology, and fails. At length he is successful, by conceiving another hypothesis complimentary to the Aryan.† It is that the autotones of the different countries the Aryans invaded, mingled their blood with those invaders, in different degrees, and that this phenomenon has occasioned the very different permanent new races who inhabit India and Europe at the present day. This is erecting hypothesis upon hypothesis by way of explaining the difficulties produced by the first hypothetic structure. The doctrine might do as an hypothesis, but cannot be accepted as consonant with scientific truth. The whole must be regarded rather as a proof of the ingenuity of its accomplished author than as affording the slightest satisfactory evidence of the consistency of the great Aryan hypothesis with truth.

* *On the Aryan or Indo-Germanic Theory.* Trans. of the Ethnol. Soc. New Series. Vol. i, p. 285.

† *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique des Sciences Médicales.* Publié sous la direction du Dr. A. Dechambre. Paris, 1866.

‡ *Anthropological Review*, vol. vi, p. 38.

But it is time that we returned to our learned author after this digression, which is intended to be suggestive and not demonstrative in any way, unless it be in showing some few of the inherent difficulties which stand at the foundation of that hypothesis the philologists have thought themselves justified to propound. "The Hellenes all had the same origin, since all were descendants of the common father, Hellen, who was the stock from which sprang the various branches of the family. This idea of their origin was accepted as an indisputable fact, and was the foundation of the faith they held in their common parentage" (p. 34). This is proved by a reference to the reply made to the Athenians when the Macedonian Alexander I. was sent by Mardonius to persuade them to separate from their alliance with Lacedæmon. They told him the Spartans and Athenians were of the same blood, the same tongue, had the same gods, the same temples, the same sacrifices, the same manners and customs, and that they would never dishonour themselves by perfidy to their brethren.

The author then enters upon an interesting chapter on "The Modern Greeks" and their ethnography. He says, the Romans did not send, as into other conquered countries, colonies into any part of Greece. The Hellenic territory was neither invaded by conquerors nor despoiled of its inhabitants. The two races remained always separate, and the Hellenic blood was never contaminated by mixture with Latin blood. But when the seat of empire was changed to Byzantium, Greece followed its fate, and participated in the mortal languor which led to its complete dissolution. Alaric scourged her. The incursions of the Vandals and those of the Ostrogoths were not less fatal to her. The Bulgarian Slavi came next, about the year 500, and after three centuries of destruction and pillage, finally established themselves in Macedonia and in some parts of the Peloponnesus, where they remained, mixed and were confounded with the native population. From this and other Slavic inundations, it has been thought that a profound modification was produced in the Hellenic stock. But the Slavic element which penetrated into this country only affected certain parts; it was not equally distributed over all Greece; and the author does not hesitate to say that this influence has been greatly exaggerated, alluding in particular to Fallmerayer and Dr. Hyde Clarke. The latter has expressed himself rather confidently in this *Review*, as to the Hellenic element being extinguished.* The author then enumerates in chronological order these Slavic invasions, and the intrusions of other races into Greece, and closes the chapter with the expression of his concurrence in the views of Zecchini, who speaks in a manner which is exceedingly decided, to this effect. "Greece, although subjugated

* Vol. iv, p. xcix.

by many foreign peoples, never made truce with them, but looked upon them always as foes, in her bosom entertaining horror and disgust towards them, like a woman who nourishes a monster at her breast. She never lived with them, never matched with them, never had anything in common with them, neither games, nor festivals, nor dances, nor feasts, nor meetings of any sort, whether for joy or for grief, and, although a slave, she is able to say she has always ruled over herself.”*

Dr. Nicolucci, in all his anthropological works, has one peculiar merit, that of using his best efforts to elucidate the craniology of the people of whom he treats, and giving it that prominence it deserves, without neglecting any other branch of the investigation; besides which, where these are ancient people, he never fails to embrace that of their modern representatives also. His most important (sixth) chapter, is dedicated to the “Crania of the Greeks,” and contains a greater amount of information than was ever before collected together upon this subject. He first of all directs full attention to all writers who have preceded him, beginning with the beautiful ancient calvarium of Blumenbach, mentioning those of Orioli, of Retzius, Prichard, Carus, Vrolik, Cordier, Pruner-Bey and Williamson. He next enumerates the ample materials he has amassed for his studies: skulls, ancient and modern, photographs, and measurements, and is especially observant of those who have aided him in collecting together these data, which he has sought with so much diligence. His own collection is rich in modern Greek crania, comprising no less than seven, the majority from the Islands. The entire amount of skulls in different museums, to which he is able to refer and of which he has got the measurements, is forty-four. Of these twenty-six are ancient and eighteen modern. The metrological data are given in two carefully prepared tables. After passing in review the principle of classification laid down by Retzius, and the various modifications of it which have been proposed by different writers of late years, he decides to make three sections upon this plan, which he regards as more than sufficient, and the only ones worth notice. He defines them thus:—

1. Dolichocephali; those skulls in which the cephalic index does not exceed seventy-four *per cent.*
2. Orthocephali; those in which the cephalic index is comprised between seventy-five and seventy-nine *per cent.*
3. Brachycephali; those in which it reaches eighty or more *per cent.*

Retzius had already concluded from his observations that the Hellenes were dolichocephalic; the Pelasgi and the Slavic people, to whom

* P. V. Zecchini, *Quadri della Grecia Moderna*. Venezia, 1866, p. 275.

he regarded the greater part of the modern population to belong, brachycephalic.

Dr. Nicolucci gives the following luminous description of the Greek skull :—

“The Greek cranium generally presents to the eye regularity and harmony in all its parts. Gentle is the curve which circumscribes the calvarium from the root of the nose to the occipital protuberance ; wide, but not very high, the forehead, which is ordinarily inclined backwards in its superior third ; the frontal tuberosities are but little visible, whilst, on the contrary, the frontal sinuses are always more or less apparent ; the root of the nose is but little depressed, and sometimes its bridge continues almost in the same line with the forehead. The straight orbits are rounded outwardly ; the forehead is slightly swollen about the temples, whence the temporal fossæ are deep, the malar bones ordinarily small, and the zygomatic arches but little prominent. The upper maxillary is orthognathous, and furnished with teeth implanted vertically ; the lower rather high and robust, but the rami are delicate and narrow, the external angle obtuse, the chin almost upright. The face is more or less oval, with an evident predominance of the upper region over the lower. That which distinguishes the Greek skull, in my opinion, is the form of the calvarium gently rounding in its anterior part, the feminineness, it might be said, of its malar bones, the narrowness of the lower jaw and the perfect orthognathism. These peculiarities give to the Greek cranium a stamp which distinguishes it at the first view from those of all other races, and we also perceive them to be the groundwork of those types of Greek art which we admire in our collections.” (P. 62.) This latter remark confirms the observations of Blumenbach.

On another page, Dr. Nicolucci tells us the Greeks were used to regard the dolichocephalic form as typical of beauty, and bestowed it on the figures of their gods and heroes : Jove, Pallas, Mercury, Venus, Artemis, the Graces, the Muses, Apollo, and all the series of Greek divinities are represented with that form of head which is conjoined with a dolichocephalic cranium ; a form which we likewise see in Niobe, Ariadne, Meleager, Helen, Esculapius, and others. It is found equally in the heads of the great men of Greece, whose likenesses are still extant, as Miltiades, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Demosthenes, Pericles, Aristotle, and so many others, whose effigies we admire in the statues, busts, and heads which adorn our museums.

“The above are the characters which generally belong to the Greek dolichocephalic skull, which is truly the head proper to the race, because the greater part of the Hellenic crania dispose themselves under this category ; but not the less may it be said that brachycephali exist ; for, as they are met with among the moderns, they were also not unknown among the ancient inhabitants of Greece ; and, in fact, among twenty-six ancient Hellenic skulls two are found

to belong to the brachycephalic class. One of these proceeds from Attica (the plain of Marathon), the other from Corfu." (P. 63.)

The major part of the brachycephalic crania of the modern Greeks of our author's table are from Epirus, inhabited in the most remote times by Pelasgic tribes, or barbarians of various names, and bordering upon Illyricum, Macedonia, and the Ambracian Gulf. The Hellenic elements were only sparsely scattered in Epirus, and never became predominant over the natives, who always represented and still represent the ethnic base of the Epirotic population.

The author tells us that the Greek artists employed the brachycephalic form, which always existed in a minority of the people, for the representation of figures in which material force and courage prevailed, where the physical faculties predominated rather than the intellectual. He refers especially to the Farnese Hercules, as an excellent model of this type: the personification of strength and vigour of limbs. It was the work of Glycon, an Athenian sculptor, who is believed to have lived in the period between Lysippus and the first Roman emperors.

But it is time that we should close this notice of Dr. Nicolucci's admirable work, the pages of which are filled with varied learning and the most mature judgment. Whether from the noble subject, or the great ability displayed in its treatment, this appears to us to be the most attractive and the most elaborate essay contributed by its author towards the great ethnographical design he has formed. To give anything like an analysis of its contents is impossible within a moderate compass; every page is deserving of special attention, and will recompense a careful study. For that portion we have not yet touched, we will avail ourselves of the lucid summary of Dr. Nicolucci with which he concludes his *Memoir*. The chapter entitled "Conclusion" terminates thus:—

"In the southern part of the continent and in the Isles, where the dolichocephalic element prevails, Greek is spoken; in the northern, where the brachycephali have acquired predominance, they speak Albanian. Acarnania and Thessaly are the limits of the two different tongues.

"The physical aspect of the Greek of the present day need not at all envy the finest types which were represented so marvellously by antique art in its splendid productions; nor are the moral characters of the present day very different from what they were in the happiest times of Greece. It is an error to say that the Greeks are lost in the ruin of their monuments, and that in their place a degraded people has arisen who retain scarcely any of the blood or of the genius of the ancient Greek men. Anthropology, sustained by numerous facts, rises up against these depreciatory words, and proclaims the Greeks of to-day legitimate descendants of that people who filled the world with its name and its glory, and was the model for all times of every

excellence, not only in knowledge, in letters, and in the fine arts, but of the most exalted civic virtue." (P. 96.)

This is the usual, almost general conclusion of anthropological inquiries in all countries, where they are conducted in a free manner and are not restricted by the requirements of any hypothetical or systematic notions, and where they are sufficiently thorough and complete to be deserving of confidence.

The fine well-executed Tables afford figures of the heads of the Venus de' Medici and the Farnese Hercules, as representatives of the two types of the dolichocephalic and brachycephalic Greeks. These are followed by a large series of crania of ancient and modern Greeks, so as to present a tolerably complete iconography of Greek skulls.

We cannot part with Dr. Nicolucci's *Anthropology of Greece* without expressing an earnest desire that we may again meet with fresh contributions from his vigorous and accomplished pen, in furtherance of the great problem the solution of which he has proposed to himself.

J. B. D.

KNOX ON THE CELTIC RACE.

WHETHER we turn our eyes to the Continent, to Ireland, or America, the present threatening attitude of the Celtic races gives a special significance to the views enunciated by the late eminent anthropologist, whose name we have placed at the head of the article. Although Knox perhaps generalised too much, and allowed his great partiality for epigram and satire, to hurry him beyond the sobriety which appertains to science, into real or apparent inconsistencies, we believe that his views are, on the whole, sound. He certainly had the merit of placing those views honestly and openly before the reader, often without the slightest mental reservation; and, so far, he has set a good example to scientific men. Even when we dispute his conclusions, when we question the good taste of the frequent political allusions in which he indulged, we cannot help admiring his moral courage. He apparently takes for his motto the pithy saying of Voltaire: "Un des plus grands malheurs des honnêtes gens, c'est qu'ils sont des lâches." He undoubtedly thoroughly weighed and appreciated the salient characteristics of the various races, and depicts them with a fidelity and